APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,543	11/30/2001	Rae K. Burns	50277-1774	1004

42425   7590   11/10/2008
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1083

EXAMINER
WONG, LESLIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/006,543
Filing Date: November 30, 2001
Appellant(s): BURNS ET AL.

Daniel D. Ledesma
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 10 June 2008 appealing from the

Office action mailed 29 October 2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

5,787,428	HART	7-1998
5,859,966	HAYMAN	1-1999
2002/0143735	AYI	10-2002

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

DETAILED ACTION

Declarations under 37 CFR 1.131

1.   Appellants submitted the declarations under 37 CFR 1.131 to swear behind the
Ayi reference. However, the declarations are not sufficient to overcome the Ayi
reference for the following reasons:

2.   The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish <u>a reduction to practice</u> of the
invention from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Ayi reference to
either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice. A general
allegation that the invention was completed prior to the date of the reference is not

sufficient. Ex parte Saunders, 1883 C.D. 23, 23 O.G. 1224 (Comm'r Pat. 1883).

Similarly, a declaration by the inventors to the effect that their invention was conceived

or reduced to practice prior to the reference date, without a statement of facts

demonstrating the correctness of this conclusion, is insufficient to satisfy 37 CFR 1.131.

See also MPEP § 715.07.

3.   The affidavit or declaration and exhibits must clearly explain which facts or data

applicant is relying on to show completion of his or her invention prior to the particular

date. Vague and general statements in broad terms about what the exhibits describe

along with a general assertion that the exhibits describe a reduction to practice

"amounts essentially to mere pleading, unsupported by proof or a showing of facts" and,

thus, does not satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.131(b). In re Borkowski, 505 F.2d

713, 184 USPQ 29 (CCPA 1974). Applicant must give a clear explanation of the exhibits

pointing out exactly what facts are established and relied on by applicant. 505 F.2d at

718-19, 184 USPQ at 33. See also In re Harry, 333 F.2d 920, 142 USPQ 164 (CCPA

1964) (Affidavit "asserts that facts exist but does not tell what they are or when they

occurred."). See MPEP §715.07.

4.   For example, in the independent claim 1, limitations "*receiving, within a database

management system…* ", "determining which policies…" and "for each operation in the

operation set…" correspond to which part(s) of the Appellants' Exhibits. Similar

comments from the above also apply to claims 6, 21, and 26.

5.   On page 3 of Applicant's Response filed on 08 September 2006, Applicant

indicated that it is **difficult to show the steps of "determining which polices…" and**

"determining whether to perform the operation". It is submitted that without

correlating the limitations of at least the independent claims to Applicant's Exhibits, the

Applicant has failed to show possession of the claimed invention.

MPEP 715.02

6.   The 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration must establish <u>possession of either the</u>

<u>whole invention claimed </u>or something falling within the claim. If the affidavit contains

facts <u>showing a completion of the invention commensurate with the extent of the</u>

<u>invention as claimed</u> is shown in the reference or activity, the affidavit or declaration is

sufficient, whether or not it is a showing of the identical disclosure of the reference or

the identical subject matter involved in the activity. See In re Wakefield, 422 F.2d 897,

164 USPQ 636 (CCPA 1970).

7.   Further, Office Policy for Actual Reductions to Practice under 37 CRF 1.131

states:

        a.   Testing is required unless operativeness of invention is readily apparent;.

        b.   Testing, if required, must be under actual working conditions or realistic

        simulation of working conditions;

        c.   Test results must be repeatable.

See MPEP § 2138.05.

8.   Appellants indicated that the Exhibits do not provide the actual code and

therefore it is not possible to show, via the Exhibits, certain features of the claims, such

as the steps of "determining which policies…" and "determining whether to perform the

operation…" as recited in claim 1.

        In response, the examiner cannot determine whether or not the reduced to

practice invention is commensurate with the claims **without the nexus between the**

claim and the Exhibit. As a result, the Examiner has no basis to approve the

affidavit. Therefore, the burden is on applicant to provide the necessary facts and

evidence to make this showing (MPEP 715.07).

9.   Accordingly, Appellants have not established prior invention. The rejection is

maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11.   Claims 1-5 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayi et al. (hereinafter "Ayi", Pub. No.: US 2002/0143735) in view of Hart (5,787,428).

As per claim 1, Ayi teaches a method for managing access to data in a database subject to a plurality of label-based security policies, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving, within a database management system, a request for performing an operation set of one or more operations on data in a table of the database (Ayi, page 1, [0006] - [0008]);

determining which policies, of the plurality of label-based policies, apply to the table based on a policy set of one or more policies associated with the table(Ayi, page 1; [0006] [0008]).

Ayi discloses determining whether to perform an operation/access on a dataset based on the label associated with the dataset (Ayi, page 1, [0006]).

Ayi does not explicitly disclose whether to perform the operation on a row, of the table. Hart teaches determining whether to perform the operation on a row of the table based on a set of labels associated with the row (Hart, Fig. 4-8, col. 6, lines 5-19).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the access control system of Ayi by incorporating determining whether to perform the operation on a row of the table based on a set of labels associated with the row as disclosed by Hart (Hart, Fig. 4-8, col. 6, lines 5-19). The motivation being to provide different security level and access management for different rows in the table.

As per claim 2, Ayi and Hart teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teach adding a policy column to the table for each policy in the policy set associated with the table (Hart, Fig. 4).

As per claim 3, Ayi and Hart teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 2, and further teach storing a label, of the set of labels associated with the row, in a corresponding policy column of the row (Hart, Fig. 4).

As per claim 4, Ayi and Hart teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 2, and further teach said step of determining which policies apply further comprising the step of determining whether a column is a policy column (Hart, Fig. 4-8, col. 6, lines 5-19).

As per claim 5, Ayi and Hart teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teach the policy set associated with the table includes two or more policies of the plurality of label-based policies (Ayi, page 1, [0006]-[0008], Hart, Fig. 4-8).

Claims 21-25 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 1-5.

12.   Claims 6-20 and 26-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. I03(a) as being unpatentable over Hayman et al. (hereinafter "Hayman", 5,859,966) in view of Ayi et al. (hereinafter "Ayi", Pub. No.: US 2002/0143735 A1).

As per claim 6, Hayman discloses a method for managing access to data in on a policy set of one or more label-based security policies, the method comprising the steps of:

registering one or more packages of routines, wherein each package of said one or more packages implements a security model that supports a model set of one or more policies of the policy set and said each package includes an access mediation

routine (Hayman, col. 8, line 67 col. 9, line 14, col. 9, line 56 - col. 10, line 4, Hayman

teaches incorporate and installation security software which inherently includes

registering one or more package of routines);

associating a first policy of a first model set in a first package with an object

(Hayman, col. 5, lines 18-60, Hayman teaches labels/policies are applied to each

object. Please note the labels are plural, which inherently includes a first policy, a

second policy, etc); and

invoking the access mediation routine in the first package to determining whether

to allow operation on data based on the first policy (Hayman, col. 3, line 44 - col. 4, line

50, col. 9, line 55 - col. 10, line 4).

Hayman teaches the security policy is applied to an object, however, Hayman

does not explicitly disclose the object is a first table within the database system. Ayi

teaches applies labels to tables in the database system (Ayi, page 1, [0006]-[0008]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the security system of Hayman by applying the

labels/policies to tables in the database system as disclosed by Ayi. The motivation

being to control access to the data in a table of the database system.

As per claim 7, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed

in claim 6, and further teach forming said each package of said one or more

packages so that the access mediation routine conforms to a specified interface for

enforcing a policy in the database management system (Hayman, con. 9, lines

1-13).

As per claim 8, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as

discussed in claim 7, and further teach said each package further comprising including

one or more administrative routines for defining a policy for the model set (Hayman, col.

9, line 55 - col. 10, line 4).

As per claim 9, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as

discussed in claim 8, and further teach one or more administrative routines for defining

a policy further comprising including one or more administrative routines for defining a

name for a particular policy; labels for the particular policy; descriptions for the labels;

and properties for the labels (Hayrnan, col. 5, lines 18-60).

As per claim 10, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as

discussed in claim 6, and further teach invoking an administrative routine of the first

package for defining the first policy (Hayman, col. 3, lines 43-49; col. 4, lines 5-13; col.

5, lines 18-60).

As per claim 11, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as

discussed in claim 10, and further teach invoking the administrative routine of the first

package further comprising providing to the administrative routine of the first package a

plurality of parameters including a policy name for the first policy and a plurality of label

names for labels of the first policy (Hayman, col. 4, lines 5-13; col. 5, lines 18-60, col. 6,

lines 45-67).

As per claim 12, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as

discussed in claim 6, and further teach in response to attempts to operate on data in a

row in the table, the step of determining that the first policy applies to the table

(Hayman, col. 5, lines 25-39, Ayi, page 1, [0006]-[0008]).

As per claim 13, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as

discussed in claim 6, and further teach associating a second policy of a second model

set in a second package with a second table within the database system; and invoking

the access mediation routine in the second package for determining whether to allow

operation on data in the second table based on the second policy (Ayi, page 1,

[0006]-[0008]).

As per claim 14, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as

discussed in claim 13, and further teach the second model in the second package is the

same as the first model in the first package (Hayman, col. 5, lines 25-60, Ayi, page 1,

[0006]-[0008]).

As per claim 15, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 13, and further teach the second model in the second package is different from the first model in the first package (Hayman, col. 5, lines 25-60, Ayi, page 1, [0006]-[0008]).

As per claim 16, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 13, and further teaches the second table is the same as the first table (Hayman, col. 5, lines 25-60, Ayi, page 1., [0006]-[0008]).

As per claim 17, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 13, and further teach the second table is different from the first table (Hayman, Col. 5, lines 25-60, Ayi, page 1, [0006]-[0008]).

As per claim 18, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 6, and further teach invoking the access mediation routine in the first package further, comprising providing data indicating the first policy to the access mediation routine (Hayman, Col. 9, line 55 - Col 10, line 4).

As per claim 19, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 6, and further teach the method further comprises the step of determining a set of allowed labels for the first policy for a user of the database management system; said step of invoking the access mediation routine is performed

during said step of determining the set of allowed labels; and the user is allowed to

operate on the data according to the first policy if the data is associated with a label for

the first policy and the label is included in the set of allowed labels for the first policy

(Hayman, Col. 5, lines 25-60, col. 9, line 55 - Col. 10, line 4).

As per claim 20, Hayman and Ayi teach all the claimed subject matters as

discussed in claim 19, and further teach storing the set of allowed labels in a session

cache for a communication session between the database management system and the

user (Hayman, Col. 8, lines 54-67, Ayi, page 1, [0006]-[0008]).

Claims 26-40 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above

for claims 6-20.

(10) Response to Argument

Arguments A:

1.   Declaration and exhibits submitted under 37 C.F.R. §1.131

2.   The evidence submitted under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 is sufficient to establish a

reduction to practice of the invention prior to the effective date of Ayi.

Appellants argue that it is the Examiner's position that the evidence submitted

under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 is insufficient to establish an actual reduction to practice of the

invention, according to Claims 1-5 and 21-25, prior to the effective date of Ayi (page 2).

The Examiner contends that the subject declaration (a) amounts to a general allegation

and (b) lacks a statement of the facts demonstrating the correctness of the declaration,

by the inventors, that the invention was reduced to practice prior to the effective date of

Ayi (page 2). It is respectfully submitted that this is incorrect.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that the

evidence submitted is insufficient to establish <u>a reduction to practice</u> of the invention

from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Ayi reference.

> **MPEP 715.02 states**:
> The 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration must establish **possession of**
> <u>either the whole invention claimed</u> or something falling within the claim. If
> the affidavit contains **facts** <u>showing a completion of the invention</u>
> <u>commensurate with the extent of the invention as claimed</u> is shown in the
> reference or activity, the affidavit or declaration is sufficient, whether or not
> it is a showing of the identical disclosure of the reference or the identical
> subject matter involved in the activity. See In re Wakefield, 422 F.2d 897,
> 164 USPQ 636 (CCPA 1970).

On page 3 of Appellants' Response filed on 08 September 2006, Appellants

indicated that it is **difficult to show the steps of "determining which polices…" and**

"determining whether to perform the operation". It is submitted that without

correlating the limitations of at least for the independent claims to Appellants' Exhibits,

the Appellants have **failed to show possession** of the claimed invention.

Appellants repeatedly indicate that the Examiner has failed to point out where in

the MPEP requires that limitations of the claims must be correlated to exhibits.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that

in actions dated from July 19, 2006 to October 29, 2007, the Examiner has spelled

out very clearly that **MPEP 715.02** requires affidavit or declaration must establish

possession of claimed invention. As such, in order to show possession of the

claimed invention it is necessary to correlate the exhibits to the claimed limitations

to facilitate evidence finding. *The examiners cannot be expected to search the*

entire record for the evidence, the difference lies in the way in which the

*evidence is presented (*MPEP 715.05*)*. Without pointing out which parts of the

exhibit are being relied upon, the submitted Declaration would not be convincing

evidence to knockdown the prima facie case.

MPEP 715.07
The affidavit or declaration and exhibits must clearly explain which facts or data
applicant is relying on to show completion of his or her invention prior to the
particular date. Vague and general statements in broad terms about what the
exhibits describe along with a general assertion that the exhibits describe a
reduction to practice "amounts essentially to mere pleading, unsupported by
proof or a showing of facts" and, thus, does not satisfy the requirements of 37
CFR 1.131(b). In re Borkowski, 505 F.2d 713, 184 USPQ 29 (CCPA 1974).
Applicant must give a clear explanation of the exhibits pointing out exactly
what facts are established and relied on by applicant. 505 F.2d at 718-19,
184 USPQ at 33. See also In re Harry, 333 F.2d 920, 142 USPQ 164 (CCPA
1964) (Affidavit "asserts that facts exist but does not tell what they are or when
they occurred.").

Appellants further argue that in support of the Patent office policy for actual

reductions to practice which states:

Testing is required unless operativeness of invention is readily apparent;

Testing, if required, must be under actual working conditions or realistic

simulation of working conditions;

Test results must be repeatable.

The Examiner cites MPEP 2138.05; however, § 2138.05 pertains to interference

proceedings and 37 CFR 1.131 does not apply in interference proceedings.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that

reduction to practice occurs in other context as well, such as 37 CFR 1.131 and not just

for interference proceedings.

> **§ 2138 states**:
> 35 U.S.C. 102(g) issues such as conception, reduction to practice and diligence,
> **while more commonly applied to interference matters, <u>also arise in other
> contexts</u>**.

Arguments B:

Claims 6-20 and 26-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly

being unpatentable over Hayman in view of Ayi.

1.   *Claims 6 and 26*

Appellants argue that neither Hayman nor Ayi taught the feature of claims 6 and 26 which require that after a policy of a package is associated with a table, an access mediation routine of that same package is invoked to determine whether an operation is allowed on data of that table.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that it is recognized that Hayman teaches associating a policy with an object but not a table. As such, Ayi is brought in to supplement the feature "associating the policy to the table". Ayi teaches "associating a first policy of a first model set in a first package with a first table within the database system" as defining a set of rules that establish a policy and generating one or more labels based on the defined policy for marking, e.g., tagging, the dataset (i.e., table). The defined policy determines the data scope that is accessible to each label (Ayi, [0006-0008 and 0064]).

Hayman further teaches the limitation "invoking the access mediation routine in the first package for determining whether to allow operation on data in the first table based on the first policy" as the Reference Monitor is the entity that mediates all requests for access to an object by a subject, and thus controls whether, and to what extent, the subject is granted access to the object. Such a Reference Monitor can be found in the earlier version of Data General's security system discussed in the

Background of the Invention above. The various subject-to-object access policies

described above can be implemented by storing various policy data in an Information

Security Policy Table database, which is maintained as part of the Reference Monitor

(col. 9, line 55 - col. 10, line 4).

As a result, the combination of Hayman and Ayi teaches the limitations as

claimed.

Appellants further argue that there is no teaching or suggestion in Hayman that

the Session Monitor, or any component thereof, is associated with a table within a

database system.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that the

Examiner has addressed this argument in the response to argument Arguments B 1.

Claims 6 and 26.

Appellants further argue that Hayman fails to teach or suggest that a policy

module and policy data (1) originate from the same package (2) that is registered with a

database management system.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that

Hayman teaches the limitation "*registering, with a database management system, one

or more packages of routines, wherein each package of said one or more packages*

implements a security model that supports a model set of one or more policies of the

database policy set and said each package includes an access mediation routine" as

the various subject-to-object access policies described above can be implemented by

storing various policy data in an Information Security Policy Table database, which is

maintained as part of the Reference Monitor (col. 9, lines 61-65). The Session Monitor

has been designed to be extensible, in the sense that the owner of the security system

can incorporate their own software to change access mode of a user or administrator, or

to process authentication transactions before allowing a user or administrator access to

the system, in either an existing mode or a new mode implemented by the said

software. In either case, integration with the supplied security system is accomplished

by writing the new software to function against interfaces delivered as part of the

security system, following policy guidelines also included with the security system. After

installation of said new software, administration of the new access mode function(s)

and/or the new authentication function(s) is accomplished in the same way, using the

same mechanisms, as administration of the access modes and authentication

method(s) delivered with the original security system (col. 8, line 67 - col. 9, line 13).

        Appellants continue to argue that Hayman does not teach or suggest that a label

is registered with a database management system.

        In response to Appellants' argument that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which Appellants

relies (i.e., "label is registered with a database management system") are not recited in

the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,

limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988

F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

    2.   ***Claims 7-20 and 27-40***

        a.   ***Claim 8***

        Appellants further argue that Hayman does not teach or suggest the

recited administrative routines, which are included in a package and are for

defining the first policy.

        In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits

that Hayman teaches the limitation "administrative routines, which are included in a

package and are for defining the first policy" as the security system of the invention

basically involves breaking up the totality of computer functions into required privileges

and assigning different privileges to each user depending on the particular job which

that user is to do on the computer system.   Also, security labels are placed on each

data file or other system resource, and on each user process. A hierarchy of labels is

created ranging from highly secret to commonly accessible and strict policies are

enforced by the security system based on these labels to determine who has what type

of access to which data files or other system resource. According to the invention, a

range of these labels is assigned to a particular user process to define a clearance

range in which the process is allowed to operate. Further, the hierarchy of labels is divided into a small number (for example 3) of regions, and a user process operating on one region is generally not allowed to access another region except in a very carefully proscribed manner (col. 1, line 54 – col. 2, line 8).

Hayman further teaches allow the security policy enforced by the system to be configurable by each site to meet its individual requirements, privilege checks are done by means of "events". An event is defined as a place in the code where a security-relevant decision is made or recorded. When the system needs to check whether a process should be allowed to perform some operation, it uses the unique event name defined for that particular privilege check to look up, in a table, the capability or capabilities which the process must possess to pass the check. By providing a mechanism for individual sites to modify the event name-to-capability table, the site can configure the system to enforce their own security policy, in addition to, or instead of, the supplied event/capability policy delivered with the security system (col. 4, lines 5-13).

Based on the above, Hayman teaches administrative routines, which are included in a package and are for defining the first policy.

b.   Claims 10 and 30

Appellants argue that nothing in the cited portion may be equated to the recited "first package" of claim 10. Thus, this cited portion fails to teach or suggest anything related to a routine of a package, much less a routine "for defining the first policy".

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that Hayman's system is directed to a security system which precisely control show has access to a computer system and the system's resources (col. 1, lines 5-10). Hayman teaches "invoking an administrative routine of the first package for define the first policy" as the security system's <u>ability to allow checks</u> to be placed on a process concerning exactly which <u>operations it can perform</u>. According to the invention, further checks can be placed on a subject's access to particular objects. According to well-known Mandatory Access Control (MAC) theory, labels are applied to each object and each subject (col. 5, lines 20-26). Hayman further teaches security labels are placed on each data file or other system resource, and on each user process. A hierarchy of labels is created ranging from highly secret to commonly accessible and <u>strict policies are enforced by the security system based on these labels</u> to determine who has what type of access to which data files or other system resource. According to the invention, a range of these labels is assigned to a particular user process to define a clearance range in which the process is allowed to operate (col. 1, line 63 – col. 4, line 4).

Appellant's broadly claimed "first package" is interpreted as any software routine or module. As such, Hayman's system provides software routines that implement strict policies on the labels to determine who has what type of access to which data files or other system resource (col. 1, lines 63 – col. 4, line 1) reads on the claimed limitation "a first package for define the first policy".

c.   Claims 11 and 31

Hayman fails to teach or suggest anything related to a package that includes an administrative routine for defining a policy.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner has addressed this argument in response to arguments b) claims 10 and 30 and claim 8.

d.   Claims 13 and 33

Hayman lacks any teaching or suggestion of the recited second package, which includes a policy and an access mediation routine for determining, based on that policy, whether to allow an operation on data in a table.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that Hayman teaches "…second package, which includes a policy and an access mediation routine for determining, based on that policy, whether to allow an operation on data in a table" as the Reference Monitor is the entity that mediates

all requests for access to an object by a subject, and thus controls whether, and

to what extent, the subject is granted access to the object. Such a Reference

Monitor can be found in the earlier version of Data General's security system

discussed in the Background of the Invention above. The various subject-to-

object access policies described above can be implemented by storing various

policy data in an Information Security Policy Table database, which is maintained

as part of the Reference Monitor (col. 9, line 55 - col. 10, line 4). Hayman's

system further teaches software routines that implement strict policies on the

labels to determine who has what type of access to which data files or other

system resource (col. 1, lines 63 – col. 4, line 1). Hayman teaches associating a

policy with an object but not table. Ayi is brought in to supplement the feature

"associating the policy to the table". Ayi teaches "… allow operation on data in

the second table based on the second policy" as defining a set of rules that

establish a policy and generating one or more labels based on the defined policy

for marking, e.g., tagging, the dataset (i.e., table). The defined policy determines

the data scope that is accessible to each label (Ayi, [0006-0008 and 0064]). As a

result, Hayman and Ayi teach the limitations as claimed.

e.   **Claims 20 and 40**

       Both Hayman and Ayi fail to suggest that the recited set of allowed labels

are stored in a session cache.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that Hayman teaches "labels are stored in a session cache" as the Session Monitor is the part of the security system which controls the manner in which a user or administrator initially gains access to the computer system, and the manner in which a user or administrator changes from their current mode of access to a different mode (for example, from user to administrator). The Session Monitor also participates in enforcing the security system's containment policy by limiting both user and administrator security credentials, no matter what their current mode of access, to maximum values established upon the said user's or administrator's initial access to the system. The Session Monitor has been designed to be extensible, in the sense that the owner of the security system can incorporate their own software to change access mode of a user or administrator, or to process authentication transactions before allowing a user or administrator access to the system, in either an existing mode or a new mode implemented by the said software. In either case, integration with the supplied security system is accomplished by writing the new software to function against interfaces delivered as part of the security system, following policy guidelines also included with the security system. After installation of said new software, administration of the new access mode function(s) and/or the new authentication function(s) is accomplished in the same way, using the same mechanisms, as administration of the access modes and authentication method(s) delivered with the original security system. The Session Monitor has also been designed

around the concept that different access modes might require different credentials and different authentication procedures. Consequently any one of the supported access modes, either originally delivered with the security system or written and installed by the owner, may require a different series of authentication steps than any other of the said access modes, including authentication steps that are processed using software written and installed by the owner of the said security system. Similarly, the Session Monitor may assign any supported access mode, either originally delivered with the security system or written and installed by the owner, a different set of security credentials (col. 8, line 55 – col. 9, line 26).

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

In light of the foregoing arguments, the Examiner respectfully requests the Honorable Board of Appeals to sustain the rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leslie Wong/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2164

Conferees:

/Charles Rones/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164

Charles Rones

SPE Art Unit 2164

/Eddie C. Lee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, TC 2100

Eddie Lee

Appeal Specialist